

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/681,475	04/13/2001	Paul L. Mullen	GEMS8081.070	7317	
27061	7590 09/20/2005		EXAMINER		
ZIOLKOWSKI PATENT SOLUTIONS GROUP, SC (GEMS)			LANEAU, RONALD		
MEQUON,	TH CEDARBURG ROAD WI 53097	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
,			3627		
			DATE MAILED: 09/20/2005	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		'Арр	lication No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary			81,475	MULLEN ET AL.				
			niner	Art Unit				
			ald Laneau	3627				
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communor Reply	nication appears o	on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence a	ddress			
WHI(- Exte after - If NO - Failt Any	HORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MENTED FROM THE MENTE	MAILING DATE C s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In munication. tatutory period will apply y will, by statute, cause t	OF THIS COMMUNI I no event, however, may a and will expire SIX (6) MON the application to become Al	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this of BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1)[🔀	Responsive to communication(s) fil	ed on 18 July 200	05					
2a)□		2b)⊠ This action						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
·	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	tion of Claims							
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the	application.						
,—	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)🖂	Claim(s) <u>1-34</u> is/are rejected.							
7)								
8)□		ction and/or elect	ion requirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers							
9)[7]	The specification is objected to by the	ne Evaminer						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.								
,			•	•				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)	The oath or declaration is objected t							
	under 35 U.S.C. § 119	,			. • . • . •			
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim	for foreign priorit	v under 35 II S.C. 8	\$ 110(a) (d) or (f)				
	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	nor toreign phone	y under 33 O.S.C. §	3 119(a)-(u) 01 (1).				
u,	1. Certified copies of the priority	documents have	heen received					
	2. Certified copies of the priority			unnlication No				
	3. Copies of the certified copies				l Stago			
	application from the Internation			received in this National	Stage			
* 9	See the attached detailed Office action	•		received				
·			ooramed dopred not	10001100.				
	•							
Attachmen			🗖					
1) Wotice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date								
3) 🔲 Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or		5) Notice of I	nformal Patent Application (PT	O-152)			
	er No(s)/Mail Date		6) Other:	·				
Patent and T	rademark Office							

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on 07/18/05 has been entered. Claims 1-34 remain pending.

2. The affidavit filed on 7/18/05 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective because the attached exhibit A mentioned in the Declaration was not received by the Office. Until then, the Wetzer reference still applies.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Worley (US 6,651,190 B1) in view of Wetzer (US 6,378,748 B2).

Worley discloses a system and method for remotely managing communication of electronic data between a diagnostic service center and a plurality of machines generally remote relative to each other including the steps of remotely collecting condition data representative of a device status (see abstract); storing the condition data on a database (database server) at a centralized facility; reviewing the condition data (see col. 10, lines 4-8); and displaying it on a graphical user interface 406 (col. 3, lines 16-26), Worley further teaches that the statistic log may be configured so that the graphical user interface allows for user-friendly manipulation of data and for example generation of reports may be implemented in graphical and/or tabular format

Art Unit: 3627

with electronic editing, copying, cutting and pasting options (col. 14, lines 4-9), a system that may be configured to generate periodic reports, e.g., weekly, monthly, etc based on the log of diagnostic statistics and the report may be configured to be distributed through the Internet or an intranet via a predetermined Web server (col. 14, lines 26-33), a system that is capable of being programmed to acquire the condition data and the reminder data via a LAN, a WAN, a telephone system, a cable communication system, and a wireless system as claimed (cols. 5-6, lines 19-23), the system of Worley would allow operators to monitor downloads in process and/or in queue and identify the type of download as claimed. Furthermore, Worley discloses notifying service technician that service is required on some components (col. 9, lines 32-36).

Worley does not teach that the GUI displays the time of the next scheduled maintenance but Wetzer teaches the step of storing data processing of components on components of an equipment, said data processing system associates at least one predictive maintenance factor (for a component) with the corresponding component data, a scheduler schedules maintenance for a maintenance time period for at least one of the components based on the first database, the second database, the associated predictive maintenance factor, and an elapsed time with respect to an installation date of at least one component, said predictive maintenance factor may be defined by one or more of the following: a longevity estimate, a probability of failure, a financial estimate on maintenance of a component (see abs), updating the maintenance file record to reflect the diagnosis, the schedule for service, etc (col. 1, lines 31-43). Furthermore, the system of Wetzer is well capable of tailoring the display for a particular user as claimed.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teachings of Wetzer into the system of Worley because it would provide ways to track diagnostic data of devices to ensure they are in proper working order.

None of the references teaches marketing data, customer-entered data, and messages are consolidated. However, these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and do not alter how the information is consolidated. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983): In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ 2d 1031 (Fed Cir 1994). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the ad at the time the invention was made to consolidate marketing data, customerentered data, and messages because the type of information being consolidated does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 7/18/05 have been fully considered but they are not 3. persuasive.

Applicant's arguments are unpersuasive since exhibit A to overcome the Wetzer reference is not received by the Office.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ronald Laneau whose telephone number is (571) 272-6784. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:30am - 6:00pm.

Art Unit: 3627

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ronald Janeau

9/6/05

Examiner

Art Unit 3627